

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

GLENN WINNINGHAM FEARN

Plaintiff,

V.

MICHAEL C. MILLER, ET AL.,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

No. 3:19-cv-1460-N-BN

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Glenn Winningham Fearn, also known in previous litigation filed in the Court as Glenn Winningham; House of Fearn, filed a *pro se* civil rights action against officials in Colleyville and Keller, Texas and the United States Attorney for this district. *See* Dkt. No. 3. His case has been referred to the undersigned United States magistrate judge for pretrial management under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and a standing order of reference from United States District Judge David C. Godbey. The undersigned enters these findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation that the Court should *sua sponte* transfer this case to the Fort Worth Division of this district.

**Applicable Background, Legal Standards, and Analysis**

Venue in a civil rights action is governed by 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). *See Davis v. La. State Univ.*, 876 F.2d 412, 413 (5th Cir. 1989). The section provides that venue is proper in the judicial district: (1) where the defendant resides; (2) where a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred; or (3) if there is no

district where the action may otherwise be brought, in any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

The Court may transfer a case to any proper judicial district or division “for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice,” *id.* § 1404(a); *see also Hardwick v. Brinson*, 523 F.2d 798, 800 n.2 (5th Cir. 1975), or may transfer a case filed in the wrong district or division “to any district or division in which it could have been brought,” 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). A district court may raise the issue of venue *sua sponte*. *See Mills v. Beech Aircraft Corp.*, 886 F.2d 758, 761 (5th Cir. 1989); *see also Empty Barge Lines II, Inc. v. DREDGE LEONARD FISHER*, 441 F. Supp. 2d 786, 789 (E.D. Tex. 2006) (“A transfer of venue may be made upon the motion of any party or by the court *sua sponte*.” (collecting cases)).

Because “a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim[s] occurred” in Colleyville and Keller, both municipalities in Tarrant County, within the Fort Worth Division of the Northern District of Texas, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 124(a)(2), the undersigned concludes that this action should be transferred to that division of this district.

### **Recommendation**

The Court should transfer this action to the Fort Worth Division of the Northern District of Texas.

A copy of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation must file specific written objections within

14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).

DATED: June 27, 2019



---

DAVID L. HORAN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE